



In The
Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1979

NO. 79-681

ROSE SHUFFMAN, as Executrix of the
Estate of OSCAR SHUFFMAN, Deceased,

Petitioner,

-against-

HARTFORD TEXTILE CORPORATION, et al., etc.,

Respondents.

**SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

DAVID K. SHUFFMAN
Attorney for the Petitioner
14 East 60th Street
New York, N.Y. 10022
(212) 755-0006

In The
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1979

No. 79-681

ROSE SHUFFMAN, as Executrix of the Estate
of OSCAR SHUFFMAN, Deceased,

Petitioner,

-against-

HARTFORD TEXTILE CORPORATION, OXFORD
CHEMICALS, INC., WELLINGTON PRINT WORKS,
INC., A. DANIEL FUSARO, CLERK OF THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT, EDWARD GUARDARO, STAFF
ATTORNEY TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF
APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT, IRVING
R. KAUFMAN, CHIEF JUDGE, AND WILFRED
FEINBERG, WALTER R. MANSFIELD, WILLIAM
HUGHES MULLIGAN, JAMES L. OAKES, WILLIAM
H. TIMBERS, MURRAY I. GURREIN, ELLSWORTH
A. VAN GRAAFEILAND, THOMAS J. MESKILL,
AMALYA KEARSE, JON O. NEWMAN, STERRY R.
WATERMAN, AND JOE INGRAHAM, JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT,

Respondents.

SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioner, ROSE SHUFFMAN, as Executrix of the Estate of OSCAR SHUFFMAN, Deceased, respectfully files this supplement to her motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and petition for a writ of mandamus, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, Section 1651.

Subsequent to the filing of the original motion, and on November 8th, 1979, the Court of Appeals granted petitioner's motion there for a transcription of the court tape of the May 9th, 1978 argument to the extent shown at Appendix 1A hereto. Although incomplete, the court-provided, unverified transcript, we respectfully assert, proves that the "corrected order" set forth at page 3A of our original moving papers was not authorized by the court.

It is interesting to note that when this fact was brought to the attention of the Second Circuit judges, those same judges failed to take the required action to conform the written order to the oral order recited at argument.

The fact that the "corrected order" incorrectly sets forth the oral order of the panel of judges then presiding permitted an incorrect order to stand for Supreme Court review.

As a result of this appearance of impropriety -- and others -- petitioner will file a second motion for leave to file a petition

for a writ of mandamus and petition for a writ of mandamus, detailing the wrongdoing perpetrated by certain Judges of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID K. SHUFFMAN
Counsel for the Petitioner
14 East 60th Street
New York, New York 10022
(212) 755-0006

November 13, 1979

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a Stated Term of the United States
Court of Appeals, in and for the Second Circuit,
held at the United States Court House, in the
City of New York, on the eighth day of November,
one thousand nine hundred and seventy-nine

PRESENT:

Hon. Sterry R. Waterman
Hon. Joe McD. Ingraham
Hon. Walter R. Mansfield,

Circuit Judges

-----x
In the Matter of Hartford Textile
Corporation, Oxford Chemicals, Inc., :
Wellington Print Works, Inc., :
Debtors :
Rose Shuffman, as Executrix of the :
Estate of Oscar Shuffman, : 78-
Appellant, : 5024
v. :
Hartford Textile Corporation, Oxford :
Chemicals, Inc., and Wellington Print :
Works, Inc., :
Appellee
-----x

A motion having been made herein by
appellant pro se for transcription of the
oral argument held on May 9, 1978 on his
motion to mandate jurisdiction back to the
district court,

Upon consideration thereof, it is hereby

Ordered that said motion be and it hereby
is granted.

/s/ A. Daniel Fusaro,
Clerk